R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 017 277 LI 000 008

LIBRARY TECHNICIANS--A NEW KIND OF NEEDED LIBRARY WORKER, A REPORT OF A CONFERENCE ON LIBRARY TECHNOLOGY SPONSORED BY CATONSVILLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE (CHICAGO, MAY 26-27, 1967).

BY- NICHOLSON, JOHN B., JR. AND OTHERS
CANTONSVILLE COMMUNITY COLL., MD.

PUB DATE JUN 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.32 31P.

DESCRIPTORS- *NONPROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL, COMMUNITY COLLEGES, CURRICULUM, JUNIOR COLLEGES, *LIBRARY EDUCATION, *LIBRARY TECHNICIANS, EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS, *CONFERENCES, JOB ANALYSIS, JOB PLACEMENT, RECRUITMENT, *VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,

REPRESENTATIVES FROM JUNIOR AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND OTHER AGENCIES ATTENDED A NATIONAL CONFERENCE TO CONSIDER THE ROLE OF THE LIBRARY TECHNICIAN IN THE LIBRARY AND THE KIND AND EXTENT OF TRAINING IN ONE AND TWO YEAR INSTITUTIONS. DISCUSSION TOPICS INCLUDED (1) DEFINITION OF A LIBRARY TECHNICIAN, (2) THE LIBRARY TECHNICIAN'S FUNCTION IN THE LIBRARY, AND (3) PROBLEMS OF CURRICULUM, RECRUITMENT, AND PLACEMENT. CONFERENCE RECOMMENDATIONS INCLUDED THE CREATION OF AN INFORMAL ORGANIZATION OF THOSE CONCERNED WITH PROGRAMS OF LIBRARY TECHNOLOGY, PROMOTION OF AN ANNUAL CONFERENCE, AND THE PUBLISHING OF A LIBRARY TECHNOLOGY DIRECTORY. A LIST OF U.S. AND CANADIAN INSTITUTIONS OFFERING ONE AND TWO YEAR PROGRAMS IS APPENDED. (PT)

DOCUMENT FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED017277

LI 000 008

Library Technicians:

A New Kind of Needed Library Worker

A Report of a Conference on Library Technology
Sponsored by Catonsville Community College
Held in Chicago, Illinois May 26-27, 1967

LI 000 008

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

COMMUNICATION SERVICE CORPORATION

WASHINGTON, D. C.

A REPORT ON THE PROCEEDINGS
OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON LIBRARY TECHNOLOGY
SPONSORED BY CATONSVILLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS MAY 26-27, 1967

BACKGROUND

Early in June, 1966, Catonsville Community College, in Catonsville, Maryland, sponsored a conference on Library Technology to which librarians, representatives of various agencies of the State of Maryland, Baltimore County, and the City of Baltimore, as well as other interested persons were invited. That first meeting, originally instigated by Mrs. Florence C. Wilmer, Director of Library Services at Catonsville Community College, was intended to do several things, not the least of which were to introduce the ideas of training and employing Library Technicians in libraries of all sorts in the Maryland area, but to explore, if possible, the nature of the work which these Library Technicians might do, as well as possibilities of their being entered into the picture of library service in this area at satisfactory salary and status levels.

It became apparent in that conference that there was considerable confusion in the minds of most of those in attendance concerning this new type of library worker. There were those who at once made it clear that they resisted the idea of establishing a new level of both salary and status among library workers in Maryland libraries. In their reaction against this idea they made it clear that they did not feel that library personnel, trained in the first two years of post high school experience, could be given enough exposure to library concepts to make them more than "glorified clerks." It became evident, too, that the term "Library Technician" had not been well defined, or, if there were any recognizable definitions, that these could be acceptable in the minds of professional librarians or library administrators. It also became evident that various agencies concerned with certification and placement of library workers in the State of Maryland, had as yet no capacity for the creation of new job descriptions and salary schedules for these new workers in the library field, although an effort was made to make it obvious that these library workers seem naturally to fit into a position somewhere above the clerical employee, and beneath the professional librarians. There was considerable discussion of these matters at this conference, but little that was conclusive came out of the discussion, and there were some who felt that much further exploration of these matters would be necessary.

As a result of this somewhat inconclusive, though valuable conference, those at Catonsville Community College who were most concerned with the problem sought other means for furthering the idea of the Library Technician as a useful, non-professional intermediate library worker. They were interested in assisting him to supplement the professional librarian's work and time, to serve under the direction of the professional librarian, and to set him in turn free for work for which his professional training most naturally would equip him. Mrs. Florence C. Wilmer, Director of Library Services, Dean Paul Johnson, and John B. Nicholson, Jr., Director of the Department of Library Technology, came to the conclusion that one useful project, and significant effort along these lines would be a conference, at the national level, of those persons involved with the various courses in Library Technology in two-year institutions. An extensive correspondence was instituted, letters going at first to all of those institutions listed in the document best known as the "Martinson Report." [1] Letters of enquiry were sent to all of those institutions with currently operating programs in training

[1] John Martinson, Vocational Training for Library Technicians. Philadelphia, Institute for Advancement of Medical Communication, 1965.

of Library Technicians as well as to those whose programs have apparently been discontinued. Twenty-six letters of enquiry were sent out, and sixteen institutions replied, all but two of which were distinctly favorable to the idea of holding a conference at some central location, at which some of the peculiar problems of training for Library Technicians at the junior college level might be explored. Even those who replied that they could not participate in such a conference indicated that they would be interested in the results of discussions which might ensue.

Those who replied and suggested that they would participate if such a conference were held, indicated in many instances those questions with which they felt the meeting should concern itself. These stated interests seem to fall into eight general categories:

1. Definition and limitation of certain mutual problems.
2. Means to promote inter-institutional cooperation in this special training area.
3. Means to develop satisfactory lines of communication between such institutions.
4. Discussion of some sort of standard core curriculum for library technicians.
5. Discussion of qualities and skills to look for in applicants for entrance into library technician training programs, and ways to determine these skills and qualities.
6. Discussion of ideas, objectives, and problems of library technology in order to enrich present programs.
7. Need to define: "What is a library technician?"
8. Discussion of curriculum content, desirable salary schedules, status of the library technician in the library.

The above list of indicated interests represents in general a collection of actual quotations from letters answering the original letter of enquiry.

On the basis of the expressed enthusiasm and interest indicated in the replies, it was decided to begin plans for a national conference. The Director of the Department of Library Technology of Catonsville Community College was given responsibility for the development of the conference and its program. He turned first to Miss Marjorie Feldman, Librarian of Central YMCA Community College, in Chicago, Illinois, asking her to be responsible for arrangements for housing the conference at the Sherman House in that city, and for the creation of a discussion panel to clarify, if possible, the definition of the Library Technician. Mrs. Catherine L. Nipe, Librarian of Salem County Technical Institute, Penns Grove, New Jersey, was then asked to assume chairmanship of a discussion panel to concern itself with various problems relating to curriculum, recruitment, and placement of Library Technicians.

For a main speaker, Miss Rose Vormelker, Vice-President and President-Elect of the Library Education Division of the American Library Association, was invited to speak concerning the Library Technician as a new kind of needed library worker. Miss Vormelker had already evinced great interest in the training of library technicians at the junior college level.

With the acceptance by the above named individuals of their responsibilities, the following program was organized for a two day series of meetings to be held at the Sherman House, Chicago, Illinois, May 26-27, 1967.

FIRST SESSION Friday, May 26, 1967 10:00 a.m.

Presiding — John B. Nicholson, Director
Library Technology Program,
Catonsville Community College,
Baltimore, Maryland

Panel discussion: What is a Library Technician?

Panel leader — Marjorie Feldman, Librarian
Central YMCA Community College
Chicago, Illinois

Panel members — Mrs. Mary Frances Root, Librarian
Black Hawk College
Moline, Illinois

Sherman Zelinsky, Librarian
Danville Community College
Danville, Illinois

Discussion period

SECOND SESSION Friday, May 26, 1967 2:00 p.m.

Speaker Miss Rose Vormelker
Vice-President and President-Elect
Library Education Division
American Library Association

"Library Technicians Help Make Libraries Work"

Discussion period

THIRD SESSION Friday, May 26, 1967 7:00 p.m.

Panel leader Mrs. Catherine L. Nipe, Librarian
Salem County Technical Institute
Penns Grove, New Jersey

Panel members Hattie M. Knight, Assistant Professor
Department of Library Science
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah

John Marshall, Assistant Professor
Department of Library Science
University of Toronto
Toronto, Canada

FOURTH SESSION Saturday, May 27, 1967 9:00 a.m.

Presiding John B. Nicholson, Jr.
Catonsville Community College
Baltimore, Maryland

Discussion topic "How can we best cooperate in the future?"

A breakdown of the attendance at the four sessions of the Conference on Library Technology reveals an interestingly national spread of interest in the matters with which the conference was concerned. Representatives came to the conference from ten states:

California	New Jersey
Illinois	New York
Iowa	Ohio
Maryland	Utah
Michigan	Wisconsin

In addition there were representatives from the District of Columbia and two Canadian provinces, British Columbia and Ontario, with three institutions being represented from Canada. Included in these representations were registrants from twenty colleges, ten of which were institutions either presently offering courses in Library Technology, or about to begin such course offerings. There were, in addition, eight industrial or research libraries represented, and four associations or agencies having interest in either the nature of the new training programs in Library Technology, or in the product of these training programs. A complete roster of those in attendance will be found in Appendix II, on page . A listing of two year and four year colleges offering programs in Library Technology will be found in Appendix III, on page

FIRST SESSION: WHAT IS A LIBRARY TECHNICIAN?

In the opening session, Miss Marjorie Feldman, chairman of the panel which had been asked to center their attention on descriptions of, and definitions of the library technician and his work, opened the discussion with a brief presentation in which she explored the official designations of library workers who could be classified as library technicians. She made the point, at once, that the term "library technician" is so new in the general field of library work that it only rarely occurs in the literature of librarianship, although it is beginning to be more common than it was ten years ago. She pointed out that in the Dictionary of Occupational Titles,[2] while there were numerous designations for librarianship, there were no titles entirely applicable to the library technician. She indicated that in the Occupational Outlook Handbook,[3] there were no designations or descriptions of library positions which were applicable to the library technician. She indicated too, that in the entries in Library Literature, the designation of library technician had only begun to be employed in recent years, and that furthermore, this designation had been apparently used for the most part in articles appearing in publications

[2] U. S. Employment Service, Dictionary of Occupational Titles. 3rd ed. Washington, D. C., G. P. O., 1965.

[3] U. S. Department of Labor, Occupational Outlook Handbook. Washington, D. C., G. P. O., 1967.

of the Special Library Association. Miss Feldman went on to point out that in Civil Service listings there occurred three titles which seem to outline the work of the library technician under such listings as Library Aide, Library Technician, and Library Supervisor, but that there did not seem to be any very clear distinction as to the nature of the work of these classifications. One of the most distinct descriptions of the work of what is popularly known as the library technician occurs in the published report of the ad hoc committee of the Library Education Division,[4] where the title Library Technical Assistant is suggested.

In the comments which followed Miss Feldman's presentation, made by the two members of her panel, the major point which seemed to be made had to do with the confusion which obviously exists within the library profession concerning the designations which should be made for library workers falling within the range of the so-called library technician. It was further made clear in the discussion by the panelists that the confusion lay not only in this area of job titles. Two official statements from the American Library Association and Civil Service publications, according to Miss Feldman, seem to spell out to some extent definitions applicable to the library technician. One of these definitions states that the library technician is an individual who has completed two years of post-high-school training (involving courses in library technology) not intended to lead to the baccalaureate degree. The American Library Association has developed a descriptive list of professional and non-professional library activities which seems, in some cases, to define certain kinds of library work for which the library technician is suitably trained and equipped. The discussion seemed to indicate, however, that both the Civil Service definition of training, and the ALA descriptions of library activities at different levels, leave much to be desired in crystallizing the neture of work for which the library technician is suited.

When the discussion following the panel statements was opened it became apparent at once that there are wide divergences of opinion concerning the titles by which library workers at the non-professional level may best be described, distinct differences as to the nature and extent of training desirable for this new group of non-professional assistants, and considerable concern as to the way in which the library technician could be fitted into the total work force of a library without disrupting well established traditional balances between the professional and non-professional groups. There was additional discussion concerning the idea that it might very well be desirable to re-examine the actual work assignments of all kinds of library workers, professional and non-professional, with the idea that many activities carried on by professional librarians could be reassigned to those working at the library technician's level.

Several things, in summary, seemed to become quite apparent during the course of the discussion which ensued. First, as already suggested, there is definite need for a designation of the library worker now generally known as a library technician, or as a library technical assistant. Second, there is a need to define and describe the work which can be done by this type of library worker, and for a differentiation of this work from that of both the professional librarian and the clerical assistant in the library. Third, it was suggested that not only should the work of the library technician be carefully and specifically described, but that once this is accomplished the library technician should not be asked to carry out work assignments in either the professional or the non-professional areas. Fourth, while it anticipated what would be discussed in a later panel presentation, it was made clear that there is marked divergence of opinion concerning the nature of the "core" of information which should be part of the library technician's background.

It followed in this discussion, that since there were few satisfactory job designations and job descriptions applicable to the library technician, there was likewise much confusion as to remuneration. There were reports of salary ranges for this type of library worker which ranged from as low as $3600 per annum to as high as $5300 for beginning salaries, with the total ranges reaching as high as $4300 and $6200 in each of these two extremes. It was suggested as these were discussed, that there seemed to be no distinct or useful pattern either for salary schedules, or for

---

[4]Report [preliminary draft] of the Joint Ad Hoc Committee of the Library Administration Division and Library Education Division of the American Library Association on sub-professional or technician class of library employees. Chicago, A.L.A., n.d.

the justification of certain salary levels on the basis of either training or experience.

As part of the discussion which brought out the apparent need for information and study on the above mentioned topics, there were some pertinent comments which should be reported here. There was at least some general agreement that the actual title, or designation for the library worker at this level, perhaps mattered less than a careful definition of his actual job. It was also suggested that in making an effort to define the kind of training and equipment which should be a part of the information contributing to the definition of the library technician, two additional definitions be given consideration. One definition of "technical" suggests that a person of "technical" capacity should have the capability of dealing with mechanical and technical gadgetry. A second definition echoes one reported by Miss Feldman by suggesting that the word "technical" indicates a level of education between high school and the baccalaureate. There was also some comment to the effect that a definition of the purpose and product of the two year college, and especially the career or terminal programs of the two year college, could well have something to contribute to a definition of the library worker generally designated as the library technician.

SECOND SESSION: LIBRARY TECHNICIANS HELP MAKE LIBRARIES WORK.[5]

The paper presented by Miss Rose Vormelker under the above title seemed to make or imply several points which aim directly at the heart of the question, Should there be still another category of library worker added to the work force in the American library scene? Miss Vormelker spoke briefly of the historical background of library education, and pointed out that in the first quarter of the twentieth century there developed in the United States a whole group of library training programs which were generally sponsored by the larger municipal libraries. She suggested that out of such programs as those developed at Carnegie Library in Pittsburgh, at the Detroit Public Library, at the New York Public Library, and numerous others, came a considerable group of the great librarians of the period. She made it clear that these were, in effect, in-service training programs, primarily aimed at developing staff for the individual library sponsoring the educational program. Yet, despite the parochial nature of these educational efforts, the products of these programs did not seem to be limited geographically when they attempted to move into other library opportunities. Miss Vormelker went on to suggest that one of the peculiar limitations which is apparently placed upon the library worker who is trained in one of the new library technology programs is his lack of mobility, the difficulty which he finds in moving out of the immediate area in which he is trained.

Another interesting point developed by Miss Vormelker was that it seems apparent that library administrators have, in recent years, not made significant efforts to study and analyze the real nature of work assignments which are made in modern libraries, and that there seems evident confusion concerning what really is truly professional library work, and what might be termed either clerical or somewhere in between the professional and clerical. In the discussion which ensued relating to this matter it was recalled that in more than a few library situations it could be shown that professionals were to be seen carrying on essentially clerical activities, and that in perhaps as many situations non-professional library workers could be discovered carrying out duties which, in other circumstances, would be unquestionable considered professional in nature.

It seemed Miss Vormelker's opinion that in some cases the non-professional, with adequate supervision and experience, could, without a doubt, be expected to gain sufficient mastery of a body of knowledge (given moderate training and reasonable opportunity) to make him proficient in the use of certain general reference sources, capable of carrying out certain activities in acquisitions work, capable of carrying out certain cataloging and classification activities, as well as some of the other more generalized library activities often carried out by the moderately trained, and well-supervised non-professional. It could also be said, it was pointed out, that even the individual considered "library trained" sometimes did not carry out these functions any better than did the non-professional.

[5]The text of the talk given by Miss Vormelker will be found in Appendix I, p.

THIRD SESSION: PROBLEMS OF CURRICULUM, RECRUITMENT, PLACEMENT.

The third session of the conference convened at 7:00 p.m. on Friday, May 26, 1967, was chaired by Mrs. Catherine L. Nipe, of Salem County Technical Institute, and had as its panel members Hattie M. Knight, Assistant Professor of the Graduate Department of Library Science, Brigham Young University, and Mr. John Marshall, Assistant Professor, Department of Library Science, University of Toronto. In the three presentations there was considerable evidence of the differences which exist in the numerous programs of training in library technology, but perhaps the most significant information which came out of these presentations and out of the discussion which followed, had to do with other equally important matters.

It might perhaps be useful at this point to summarize these matters in numbered items:

1) It was pointed out that different programs in different parts of the country were motivated by different needs. Thus, in some cases, as at Brigham Young University, there had appeared an obvious need for training non-professional library assistants for the school systems of that region. In another institution the training had a strong leaning toward non-professional assistance in hospital libraries. In still a third, college libraries in the area served by the Library Technology program had expressed need for library technicians. At still another, a large group of special libraries, including industrial, research, and hospital libraries, made a ready market for the library technicians produced by the school.

2) The source of supply for recruitment into the various programs was likewise varied, and affected by somewhat unexpected elements. Thus, several of the programs, originally anticipating that their recruits would largely come from high school graduates in their communities, looking for terminal education programs, found instead that their students came almost entirely from two entirely different groups, a) women college graduates, with teen-age children, preparing themselves for work to help educate those children; and b) women in their late thirties and early forties, looking for training to prepare them for work to supplement family budgets.

Another institution, anticipating largely adult applicants, found that the recruits were coming from the high school graduating groups who had no intention of pursuing a full four-year academic program.

A third situation found applicants coming from local public and college libraries, having served as clerk-assistants, and now preparing to better their status in the library work force of that community.

3) One interesting, and provocative situation was described by a representative of one of the middle western institutions who pointed out that in a large,mid-western school system a policy was evolving which provided for the appointment of one professional elementary school librarian and six or sometimes more library technicians who were assigned, one each, to the elementary schools. The professional librarian became a rotating supervisor, with the work done in each library under the supervision of that professional.

4) It was brought out in discussion that, whereas the Martinson Report had, in 1965, located twenty-six programs in Library Technology, aimed primarily at the two year post-high-school student, this number has now grown to nearly double that number, and it is quite certain that not all of the programs already in existence have been reported. The present number of known programs in library technology amounts to forty-five, with a considerable number under development in Canada, and others appearing almost weekly in the United States.

5) It was made clear that just as much confusion exists in regard to the "core" of library technology education, as does in the terminology which is applied to its work and its workers. There appears to be a range of subjects taught in the curricula of the library technology program which extends from courses in circulation methods and book preparation, of the most elementary nature, to courses which represent content comparable to many junior-senior level courses, and even in some cases certain graduate level courses.

6) Out of the discussion concerning curricula it became apparent that there is need for much exploration of course content, of course pre-requisites, and in general, of total curricular organization.

7) Still another difference appeared when John Marshall of the University of Toronto reported the rapid development of programs in Library Technology. It is evident, in the Canadian programs already established, that there are already certain differences between them and the programs in the institutions of the United States. These differences should be explored, and as much as possible, these differences should be reconciled.

8) Some problems which seem peculiar to the two year Library Technology programs, relate to recruitment, as has already been implied. It seems particularly difficult, for example, to recruit for any kind of library work among high school students. The old problems of the library stereotype, of the apparent sedentary nature of library work, and the tradition of its being "withdrawn" from everyday life, seem still to affect recruitment. There is very obvious need for investigation of ways and means to recruit for these new library jobs.

9) An equal number of problems relating to the placement of Library Technicians appear to affect graduates of these programs in the two year institutions. No clear-cut definition of the work of the library technician as opposed to either the library clerk or the library professional has been made. This has resulted in confusion as to a) the status of the library technician, b) the place which he is to assume in the work line of the library's activity, c) the financial status of the library technician. In addition, it has created a situation in which the "mobility" of the library technician is as much in question, if not more so, as is that of the library clerk.

From the above it should be evident that there is a real need for an understanding that those institutions offering courses in Library Technology are not preparing either library professionals, nor library clerks, but a new kind of library worker, capable of carrying out many activities which may well have been carried out by professionals, and capable of work significantly above that of the library clerk of civil service status. It would seem that what appears to be resistance against the development of training programs for this type of library worker is based upon two major things. First, confusion among those who are developing the training programs as to the proper nature of their particular body of library skills, and of their curricula; and second, a failure to understand a) the kind of library worker who is envisaged as the product of such library technology programs, and b) the significant possibility of developing a new level of library work within the well established present-day hierarchy of library service.

10) Discussion returned more than once, both during the conference sessions, and in informal discussion to the peculiar problem of "mobility" which affects both recruitment and placement of the Library Technician. The same lack of mobility which often affects the shift of an individual trained in an excellent in-service program seems to affect the Library Technician. This is partly due to the fact that in many cases, those training in Library Technology Departments in two year institutions are being sent to those institutions by their local libraries as a means of producing library assistants in some type of formal educational institution, and without the high cost of maintaining an in-service training program. This means that the individual thus sent to a Library Technology department will focus his specific attention, perhaps too often, on the local library, thus losing to some extent the benefit of the "generalization" of the training program. This, in turn, results in a too specific training of the individual for a particular institution, and thus limits his acceptability as an applicant for a similar position in another library.

Some comment was made relative to the fact that the development of training courses in Library Technology, and the association of these training programs with junior colleges and other two year institutions, was somewhat comparable to the historical movement of the library schools into intimate relationships with academic institutions of higher education, removing them from their original status of in-service and "certificate" programs, and providing them with academic respectability in fact by that association.

11) A matter of great concern to those in attendance at the Chicago conference was the lack of communication between those involved with the development of the new Library Technology programs. The point was made more than

once that there was too little common information concerning course offerings, course content, matters of administrative organization, matters relating to placement, recruitment, and standards of acceptance for entrance into the two year programs in Library Technology. Likewise there was an expressed need for comparative study of quality standards in the various programs. It was suggested that at least a partial improvement of this situation might be effected by some kind of regular publication, in the form of a newsletter, or some similar communication.

FOURTH SESSION: Saturday, May 27. 9:00 a.m.

The fourth session of the conference, presided over by John B. Nicholson, Jr., of Catonsville Community College, was directed toward discussion of ways and means better to cooperate in the future, and provide a steadily improving collaboration among those concerned with programs in Library Technology in two year institutions, especially in the United States and Canada.

The first matter taken under discussion was that of the purposefulness of creating a formal organization of those concerned with two year programs of Library Technology, and the development of Library Technicians. The discussion was, in general, in favor of such an organization, but there were numerous suggestions as to the manner in which it should be carried out. It was urged than an effort be made, first, to seek other already established organizations to which this group might be attached, and among those organizations named were those sections of the American Library Association directly concerned with junior college library activity in the Library Education Division, the American Association of Junior Colleges, and the Special Library Association. Opinions varied as to the advisability of associating the group at this early stage of its development with any large organization. There was an expression of the idea that the very evident need to explore such matters as the definition of "What is a Library Technician?", what is the desirable core of education for the library technician, as well as those matters listed in the summary of the previous session of the conference, could perhaps at first best be carried out in meetings involving only those directly and immediately concerned with these Library Technology programs.

The discussion went on to a conclusion that perhaps it would be best, for the present, to establish only an informal organization, and to await any formal association until more is known as to the needs of the group. It was therefore moved and seconded that the group go on record as being in favor of an annual meeting, of a somewhat similar nature as the present conference, to be held in a geographically central city. The motion was passed unanimously. Further discussion suggested that a meeting date be established close to the time of the current meeting, in late May, with two purposes: first to establish a definite date, and second to make such a meeting conveniently close to the Summer meetings of the American Library Association, to make possible communication of deliberations and conclusions of this Library Technology Conference at the annual ALA conference.

A second motion was made to the effect that each year the Library Technology Conference would provide for a committee of three to prepare for the conference of the following year. It therefore became necessary at this 1967 conference to elect a chairman for the 1968 conference, a vice-chairman for that same 1968 conference, who would serve as vice-chairman and chairman elect. It was then suggested as an addition to the motion that this would mean that in each succeeding year it would only be necessary to elect the vice-chairman. It was likewise added to the motion that the committee henceforth be made up of three members:

1) Chairman for the next year
2) Vice-chairman and chairman-elect
3) Chairman of the preceding year

It seemed tacit in this agreement that such a committee would becharged with continuing from year to hear the matters of interest and concern for the group, would provide continuity from year to year with the presence of the three persons representing three years of the conference.

The following persons present were nominated for the offices designated here, and were elected by unanimous ballot:

Chairman, 1968 conference	Mrs. Rhua Heckert University of Toledo Toledo, Ohio

Vice-chairman, Chairman-elect for 1969 conference — Mrs. Aline C. Wisdom, Citrus College, Azusa, California

Committee Member, 1968 — John B. Nicholson, Jr., Catonsville Community College, Baltimore, Maryland

As another means of providing a continuing interest in the matters of concern to the conference, it was suggested by Mr. Nicholson, that it would be worth while to explore the possibility of developing for each Fall a two day workshop which could be employed as an instrument for exploration of the various problems which had been defined in the current conference. Among those problems which seem of most significance for such a workshop, perhaps in October of 1967, were such topics as:

Development of a satisfactory terminology relating to the Library Technician

Study of the most desirable core of education for the Library Technician

Study of problems of recruitment and placement of students

Although no motion was made or voted upon, it seemed a consensus that such a workshop would be desirable, and it was left to the incoming chairman to explore the idea of such a workshop, and to develop it if it seems feasible.

There was a continuation of discussion relative to the desirability of associating this group and its interests with some established organization of national stature. Mrs. Rhua Heckart spoke of her agreement with the idea that involvement with a larger organization is necessary, but she pointed out that it is very difficult, during a large convention, involving many people whose interests are not those of the smaller group, to get down to specifics and get a great deal accomplished.

The next project which came under discussion was the production of some sort of directory, at least to contain a listing of all of the institutions offering courses in Library Technology, and if possible to include not only the names of those officially responsible for each program, but a listing, as well, of the instructors engaged in teaching the courses in each institution. Mr. Charles Held of Albion College, Albion, Michigan, who has been gathering information concerning Library Technology programs throughout the United States, suggested that since he already has in hand considerable information concerning each of the known programs, and is gathering more information at a rapid pace, he would be willing to produce the first such directory of Library Technology, including probably not only listings of the institutions engaged in this field of instruction, but listings of faculty and officers as well.

Mr. John Marshall of the University of Toronto suggested that he hoped that the involvement of Canadian institutions in this present conference, and their very evident rapidly growing commitment to Library Technology should make it certain that Canadian institutions and personnel would be included in any directory which might be produced. It would make certain their receipt of all proceedings which appear concerning the present as well as future conferences on Library Technology. He also hoped that there would continue to be communication between American and Canadian institutions concerning related happenings, and the development of workshops in this area.

Another project which came up for interested discussion revolved around the possibility of a study, perhaps sponsored by the group in some fashion, which would represent a study of job descriptions for Library Technology, and a follow up of the graduates of Library Technology programs in the United States and Canada. It would include such topics of study as:

1) Information concerning the graduate and his work during the period of study in Library Technology

2) Description and analysis of the position in which the individual is employed with:

a) Description of the job made by the library technician
b) Description of the job made by the supervisor in the library or place of employment
c) Description of the job made by the library school officer who may have been involved with the placement
d) Investigation of the type of salary received
e) Investigation of the status of the library technician in the library of employment

It was also suggested that a comparative study of the performance of Library Technicians versus in-service training personnel would be of both interest and value.

Brief discussion followed concerning the need for information related to various types of certification by agencies charged with responsibility for such certification. Mr. Marshall commented on Canadian legislation for certification, and especially mentioned efforts to establish certification on a legal basis in the province of Ontario. He made it clear that while first steps have been taken along this line, much remains to be done, and that the acceptance of the idea of professional certification, which could well affect the status of Library Technicians in that province, has hardly begun to be apparent. He suggested that further information concerning this certification effort might be obtained by writing to M. Victor Whatton, Department of Education, Ontario, Canada.

Miss Hattie Knight commented on Civil Service standards which now distinguish the levels of education necessary for different types of library employment. Mr. Held read a communication from the U. S. Department of Labor in which it was indicated that they are investigating this area.

SUMMARY OF MORE IMPORTANT CONCLUSIONS OF THE CONFERENCE

A. There was general agreement, to begin with, that the conference had considerable value because it made it possible to identify for the first time, many institutions offering courses in Library Technology. Likewise, there was mutual identification between those institutions and persons concerned with training Library Technicians, and those who were potential employers of the graduates of those institutions.

B. The Library Technology instructors, as well as those who attended to learn what Library Technicians might do to help solve serious personnel problems, agreed that a useful project would be to develop an informal organization which could provide for discussion, exploration, and perhaps solution of mutual problems in Library Technology Education.

C. It was agreed by those present that proceedings of the conference which would report these modest beginnings would be published and distributed as widely as possible.

D. It was agreed that it was most desirable that a Library Technology directory be produced, published and distributed, and that Mr. Charles Held, Albion College, Albion, Michigan, would be responsible for the first such directory.

E. It was agreed that the informal organization would promote an annual conference, built on similar lines to this present conference. To this effect, three persons were elected, as reported above, to form a committee to carry out this assignment in the coming year, and the year following.

F. It was agreed that this present conference would be represented, wherever possible, at the various and appropriate meetings at the ALA conference and pre-conferences in San Francisco by the following individuals, who would be supplied, as early as possible, with copies of the proceedings of this conference:

Mrs. Aline C. Wisdom, Citrus College, Azusa, California
Mrs. Rhua Heckart, Toledo University, Toledo, Ohio
Miss Diana Hovorka, State University of New York, Alfred, New York
Mr. Seymour Schneider, Illinois Teachers College, Chicago, Illinois
Miss Lottie Skidmore, Joliet Junior College, Joliet, Illinois
Mr. Charles H. Held, Albion College, Albion, Michigan
Dr. Lester Asheim, American Library Association, Library Education Division, Chicago, Illinois

G. It was decided that copies of the proceedings would go to all of those institutions listed in the Appendix II (page) as being concerned with programs of Library Technology. It was also decided that, in so far as possible, copies of the proceedings would be made available to all junior colleges having an interest in such proceedings. Likewise copies of the proceedings will be sent to appropriate journals and bulletins in the general field of librarianship.

APPENDIX I

PRESENTATIONS AND TALKS GIVEN BY SPEAKERS

OPENING REMARKS MADE AT SESSION I

JOHN B. NICHOLSON, JR., CATONSVILLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

The purpose of this meeting should be self-evident once one has looked over the nature of the program. There are some twenty seven or eight institutions across the country which are now offering courses in Library Technology, most of them being offered at the level of the first two years of college work, and most of them resulting in the usual Associate of Arts degree which is typical of the junior college. Because there has been little opportunity for more than casual correspondence among those responsible for these programs, and because too little opportunity for exchange of information of common interest has been possible, it was thought that a conference at which some of these major questions which occur to all of us might be aired and discussed, would be of significant help.

There are several matters, all of which will certainly come up either in the presentations of the panels, or in the discussions which will follow those panels, which seem to recur most often in the conversations which have occurred among those of us who have been in touch with each other:

a) It seems to many of us that there has not yet been propounded a satisfactory name for the kind of library worker being turned out of the programs in library technology at the two year level.

   1) Library Technician seems the one most often called upon to describe these people, and yet it seems something less than satisfactory.

   2) Library Associate has some advantages, and yet many objections have been raised to it.

b) The question has come up more than a few times concerning the existence of a "core of information" which would be desirable for such library workers to hold. Partly because library work into which these people are put has never been adequately described or defined, this "core" seems most nebulous.

c) As a step toward solving the problem implied in (b), it might prove worth while to explore the kinds of work to which graduates of the library technology programs have been assigned, or at least it might prove fruitful to discuss what information we have.

d) It certainly is not the province of this group to define once again just what is meant by "professional library work," and yet it would be rather useful to us in our self examination to know what the term does actually mean.

e) Just where, in the hierarchy of the library staff should such individuals as the library technology programs are producing expect to find themselves, and what should be their relationships with their fellow staff members, both professional and clerical.

f) While individual discussions seem to indicate that there are no established patterns for the kind of person, in terms of background, training, inherited skills, and personality traits, who applied for entrance into the new library technology programs, such an exploration might prove interesting and useful.

g) Are there differences, in terms of geographical location at least, in the kinds of library technology curricula which are developing?

h) To what extent are the graduates of library technology programs going to be useful in solving some of the acute staff problems which obviously exist?

i) Library technology at the level with which we are immediately concerned has been accused of several things. Among them have been implied in remarks by professional librarians such as:

1) If this kind of person is brought onto the library staff what will there be left for me (us) to do?

2) Library workers trained at the undergraduate level will, if permitted to assume positions in libraries, seriously dilute professional librarianship.

3) Library technology programs at the undergraduate level raise false hopes in their graduates that they can, or may, become "instant librarians."

To what extent, if at all, are these library ghosts which are raised actually true, providing library work is properly segmented and defined at its various levels?

PRESENTATION AT SESSION II

ROSE L. VORMELKER

LIBRARY EDUCATION DIVISION, A. L. A.

Introduction

This rather pontifical-sounding title certainly expresses an obvious fact. Every library - worthy of the name - be it school, college, public, or special, needs workers of varying capacities, even of varying professional training: (e.g., accountants, subject specialists, etc.) to perform all of the functions for which the library exists.

Very few libraries are managed by one trained professional librarian or even by a group of trained professional librarians and finding the right kind of assistance to help these librarians function at the level for which their training and abilities fit them, has become one of the profession's major problems today.

Apprentice Courses

In the past some of the larger libraries conducted apprentice courses which were offered to members of their staffs who showed an aptitude and ability for development in library work. Some "graduates" of these apprentice courses became leading and significant librarians, making genuine contributions to the field of librarianship. For others, these apprentice courses served to supply their respective institutions with efficient staff in sub-professional capacities that bridged the gap between file clerks and professional graduate librarians.

Library Schools

All this took place before library schools, in the numbers we have today, (38 accredited schools) existed. In fact, some of those responsible for apprentice courses in libraries were pioneers in encouraging the establishment of library schools and helped develop curricula and standards for these schools. Furthermore, the few schools that did exist were widely scattered throughout the country.

So long as library schools graduated an acceptable number of librarians for the professional opportunities which existed, and libraries could afford apprentice courses and/or in-service training for non-professional staff, and appropriations were kept at the proverbial low level, the "crisis" note was kept pretty much within the family. The situation was deplored, but the profession could only say we could do more if we had more and better librarians. We could get more and better librarians if they were better paid, if librarianship were a prestige profession, etc. etc. It was a little like, "If we had some ham we could have ham and eggs, if we had some eggs."

Government Interest

Then came a war and its aftermath. The Government, the military, the production plants, the home front desperately needed what libraries and librarians could best supply -- but there weren't enough of them. A new field developed -- that of the "Information Specialist" -- who had to get his information from the low-paid librarian! An "Information Specialist" was considered "essential" to the war effort. Few "libraries" were.

The story of this phenomenon is fascinating in itself, but has a bearing on the subject of this group's interest today primarily because it was one of the contributing factors to the increase of libraries, and/or the use of libraries, with their need for more and more librarians and in turn, their need for more and more assistance.

Administrators, desperate for staff grasped at many straws to find help. If a body was "warm to the touch", they felt it better to engage him than to have no one around. Libraries were not alone in this dilemma. Hospitals, schools, and many other fields regretfully shared it with us.

Machinery and Broadening Base of Educational Opportunities

Whenever labor is scarce, efforts to find mechanical means to replace it multiply, and library operations have come in for their share. Again, it was to be expected that hand operations would be taken over by the machine. No longer can it be said, in general, that all librarians do is to sit at a desk and stamp books. The charging machine has taken that over. Today's machines go much further. Information retrieval by machine is in use in some libraries and not a dream. Indeed the possibilities of retrieving information and producing data in needed form has bred an entirely new approach to library work, namely "Information Science" for which special curricula are now in process of development.

Simultaneously with the use of the machine comes another situation which must be met. Machines break down and the repairman will be in great demand. Unskilled labor will find little place in the age of machine technology. This is just one of the reasons why leaders in business, education, social service, civic affairs, and other fields have come to realize the need for more education, better education, education for the masses.

In this dichotomy of education, we find colleges, universities, and library schools raising their standards for admissions and graduation; while at the same time, attempts are made to broaden the base for education through junior colleges and community colleges. But enough of this prolegomenon!

Federal Funds

Federal funds for library programs began with the passage of the Library Services Act of 1956 and the even broader Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. These actually make it mandatory that more libraries serve more people in more ways than was dreamed of by the scholar librarian of the Alexandrian library or even by librarians twelve to fifteen years ago.

Ironically enough this growth has made it necessary for professional librarians to do many chores that could be performed just as adequately and maybe even more so by a person with less professional training, thus freeing the professional person for duties only a professional librarian should attempt -- planning, developing, making management decisions, supervising in-service training, supervising or engaging in reference research work and bibliography.

The Community College and Library Courses

This is the dilemma in which libraries find themselves -- more opportunities to serve in more ways than ever before, fewer qualified librarians to perform these services. A division of labor appears to be an obvious need -- to separate, sensibly, those duties which require professional library school preparation from those for which a community college course could prepare a worker.

One should not, however, confuse one with the other. This will take great study and great judgment.

Can we learn from other disciplines? A surgeon to whom you would trust removal of an appendix is not trained over night. By the same token, a librarian's training takes years of background and study. But intelligent assistants in both fields can be prepared in less time.

That there are doubts and questions about Community College Library Technicians' courses is axiomatic. This appears due to their topsy-like growth and the concern that technicians may be considered as fully qualified librarians by some library boards or business executives.

If this be true, the last state of library service - and of librarians - might become worse than the first. It is up to the librarians, the Community and Junior Colleges and the library schools to work out a sensible solution, assuring cooperation and understanding.

The Community College affords young people an opportunity to acquire some skills that may well prevent a future W. P. A. or an enlarged scrap heap of human beings. It can relieve the manpower shortage to a degree. It should make possible the freeing of professionally-trained people for professional work. It can enhance the prestige of the professionally trained, but to attain these goals will take the "bloomin' cooperation of every bloomin' soul."

What is required?

Here are a few suggestions (purely my own):

1. The work of a library technician must be defined. This in itself requires much consideration, for there are so many intangibles in library service, it is difficult to find words to express their meaning adequately. This must be clarified so as not to be confused with the work of pages, file clerks, typists, as well as to distinguish it from professional creative and interpretive work.

2. Courses for library technicians should be designed to meet specified standards, be taught by qualified instructors, and be endorsed by national bodies, primarily the American Library Association, the American Association of School Libraries, the Special Libraries Association and the American Association of Junior Colleges. This is needed to assure mobility of workers.

3. Once the title is defined and courses are endorsed by national library and community college associations, it should be made part of the U. S. Department of Labor's Dictionary of Occupations, and of every vocational guidance counselor's "kit" of information. Much of the midunderstanding of work in libraries can be traced to the vocational guidance counselor, whose concept of work in libraries is only that it requires a "love of books"!

Dr. Lester Asheim pointed out in his paper in Library Journal for May, 1967 (p. 1796) an interesting and possibly unexpected turn of events in registrants in California; namely, that the typical applicant for library technician courses was not only the recent high school graduate, but college graduates returning to the labor force after their home duties had resolved themselves to the extent where they could and wished to return to school for other work preparation.

If this is indicative of a trend, the library field may well find a source of dependable assistance which has a very definite place in the world.

All in all, this may be considered as Victor Hugo's phrase as an "idea whose time has come."

COMMENTS MADE AT SESSION III

HATTIE M. KNIGHT, BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

Before I attempt to consider these questions, I would like to explain a little of our own local situation and hope that all of you will be able to identify with it and thus see the problem a little more in its entirety.

This may seem as confusing as the story of the man who mounted his horse and rode rapidly in all directions. I have been increasingly more mixed up as our Conference has progressed.

Let me begin by explaining that at Brigham Young University we now have three levels of library education, each one developed because of demand, mostly local or within the State.

First of all, it was necessary to provide training for school librarians. Utah required a teaching certificate and nine quarter hours of Library Science. The four teacher training institutions of the State each provided courses for the library certificate; but it was not until a committee representing each College or University was appointed to coordinate them did we have comparable programs. One thing that happened was that by the time required subjects were included at least twelve to fifteen hours had been earned. This was a little better for the schools and for the librarians. But the really useful help came when the American Library Association concluded that there were literally hundreds of undergraduate programs with a great variety of courses taught, credit given, and personnel doing the teaching. In 1959 standards and goals were published for undergraduate programs. Besides serving as a stabilizer for curriculum, one full-time person to direct the program was required. This was the best thing that could have happened to strengthen the undergraduate programs that seemed, then and now, destined to be with us at least for a long time.

The great need now for the institutions giving training for library technicians is for direction from qualified people on the national level, on curriculum, on faculty, on definition of terms, and classification of levels of training. This is needed for those who are organizing and teaching, for administrators of such institutions, and for library boards and library directors who are the potential employers of the technicians. They need to know the difference in levels of preparation and expected performance.

To get back more directly to the curriculum program, I noted that others were concerned, as I was, when Miss Vormelker said that in her judgment, courses for technicians and courses for undergraduate programs should be the same. After trying without success to discontinue the technician program in our University, I rewrote the courses entirely. Actually, out of the total 64 semester hours, only 13 of them are Library Science courses, about the same number are business courses, and the rest is made up of general education. This seems to me a good proportion. I believe very strongly in a good cultural background and a good grade point average for admission. We have asked for a 2.5 or C+ average for our technicians as they begin the program.

Another question seems important to me. I hope there are no "watered down" courses. It does seem to me that we can have developmental courses in a kind of sequential process. How can we specialize before we generalize. I don't think we should teach our school librarians a specialized course in school librarianship any more than that we should teach technicians only skills such as filing. In our State at present, there is a definite move to eliminate the word "library" entirely in favor of the "Instructional Media Center." I even

received a letter addressed to the Instructional Media Center at Brigham Young University. It was sent all around the campus before it finally reached me in the library. This could be another indication of a need for technicians. In fact, the Technical College in our city has just announced a new program to train audio-visual technicians to serve as library aids. My guess is that they will be concerned with the operation and upkeep of machines, and the making of teaching materials such as tapes and transparencies.

New teaching methods and increased demands of scholars, industry, and of continuing education are likely to make more and more personnel necessary. Surely there can be three levels in education for library service. We cannot, as someone has said, "all be scholars, managers, teachers and technicians at the same time."

Up to this point, almost nothing has been said about a core curriculum and the time is gone. Let me say in conclusion that there is some evidence that certain courses seem to be common to most programs. A review of John Martinson's Vocational Training for Library Technicians indicates that a course in Book Selection and Order Procedure is common to 10 programs; Introduction to Library or Use of the Library to 20 programs; Classification, Cataloging and Filing to 14 programs; Reference to 14 programs; Circulation, Maintenance and Preparation of Materials to 10 programs; Practice work is required by at least 11; and Library Clerical Techniques by at least 8 institutions.

This would indicate a tendency toward a core. The many other titles appearing only in one or two cases indicates a great deal of diversity and some special local needs.

I am inclined to think that secretarial training alone is not enough even with on-the-job orientation. Another need is for proficiency in the audio-visual area, at least use of machines and equipment, for both school and public libraries.

Teacher preparation courses for school librarians need to be basic and scholarly courses, not simply skills or specializations.

PRESENTATION AT SESSION III

JOHN MARSHALL, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

TECHNICIAN PROGRAMS IN CANADA

Library technician training programs are a comparatively late development in Canada, sharing certain features with their American counterparts: they have arisen only in recent years, and in an independent and sporadic fashion; and they are now proliferating quite rapidly. I cannot begin to provide you with an up-to-date list. Let me, therefore, list only the best known as examples of what is happening - and first, those outside my own province of Ontario:

Manitoba Institute of Technology, Winnepeg, Manitoba - a one-year course for "Library Assistants."

Mount Royal Junior College, Calgary, Alberta - a one-year course now being taken over by the University of Calgary - on a two-year basis.

Vancouver City College, Vancouver, B. C. - a one-year course to commence in 1967-68.

College de Jonquière, Jonquière, Quebec - a two-year course in a classical college, one of several existing or planned in this province.

Of the above, the one-year courses are exclusively library-oriented, with little or no liberal arts content. I think it is fair to say that such courses train library clerks but not technicians, in the fully acceptable sense of that term. It may be significant (a) that the one-year graduates in Winnipeg and Calgary have not been too well received by the profession, and (b) that the Calgary course has now been expanded to two years.

In Ontario, a two-year course in "Library Technology" at Lakehead University, Port Arthur, enrolled its first students in 1966. In 1967 a two-year course in "Library Arts" will commence at Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, Toronto.

The most exciting developments, however, are those associated with the new Ontario community colleges, officially designated Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology. These are to be true community colleges, accepting and upgrading adults at various stages of pre-college education, as well as young graduates of the grade 12 academic or technical high school programs and grade 13 graduates of the academic program (the latter normally go on to university). Two types of diploma will be given, one for a two-year program after grade 12, the other for a three-year program after grade 13. There has been a vigorous debate as to transferability of credits from community college programs to the Universities. It is too soon to predict the final outcome, but two-year diploma holders may at least qualify for university entrance (i.e., the equivalent of grade 13), while three-year diploma holders should be able to transfer quite easily at the second year university level.

Eighteen such community colleges are planned, one for each major centre or region of the province. Seventeen are to be opened in the fall of 1967. All seventeen will eventually have library technician programs, but only three will commence in 1967. These will be in Ottawa, Hamilton, and North York (a borough of Metropolitan Toronto).

The library technician programs will be for two years after grade 12, or (with very few students expected here) for one year after grade 13. These programs, it should be stressed,

have been planned centrally by the Ontario Department of Education, under the guidance of the Supervisor of Libraries in the Applied Arts and Technology Branch. Assisting him, however, and contributing to the shape of the program as planned, has been an Advisory Committee of experienced professional librarians, representing major segments and interests of the profession. Also, for the implementation of the program in each community college, a local advisory committee including librarians has been set up. These committees are concerned, among other things, with the maximum adaptation of the basic program to specific local needs. (At one point a curricular leeway of 20% for local needs was suggested.) The best example of local requirements is the program in Ottawa, which should be tailored as much as possible to the needs of government libraries in the capitol area.

Many problems are involved in this sudden implementation of a long recognized need for community colleges, not least of which is the lack of library collections on which to base not only the academic program but also the training of library technicians. This will be taken care of, in part, by a crash program of purchasing, cataloguing and processing a limited basic collection for all 17 colleges, to be directed temporarily by the library of McMaster University, Hamilton.

SOME DIFFERENCES FROM U.S. PROGRAMS

The Ontario community colleges differ in several basic respects from the typical American Junior College. Two have been mentioned: the limited transferability of credits to university programs, and the awarding of diplomas rather than degrees such as the Associate in Arts. The community colleges are envisaged in fact as being quite separate from the universities, and intended essentially for those students who do not go on to university - but with provision for the few who discover an academic bent to transfer, subject to university entrance regulations. Another difference, apparent in the library technician programs, is the greater amount of governmental planning and direction or at least "central co-ordination" in Ontario, in contrast with the usual American pattern. Here it must be remembered that in Canada all curricula at the elementary and secondary school levels are traditionally set by the province - in some cases quite rigidly, in others with more or less provision for local options and adaptations. We accept such planning more readily, perhaps, in Canada - but we also insist on getting into the act! So it is that the central and local advisory committees were set up, as much on the insistence of the profession as on the initiative of the provincial Department. It should also be noted that the community college programs and curricula were examined critically by (and reflect the suggestions of) not only the advisory committee but also the Special Libraries Association - Toronto Chapter; the Ontario Library Association; and the Institute of Professional Librarians of Ontario. Some degree of central co-ordination, with the profession participating in the planning process, is in my opinion essential.

Another interesting development is the fact that, under the certification scheme for public libraries in Ontario, there is now a specific category for the graduates of library technician training programs. The Certification Board, which operates under the Provincial Library Service, now has certificates in two categories: Certificates of Librarianship, A, B, and C, for professional librarians with various types of training and educational background; and Certificates of Library Service, for sub-professional workers employed at a level beyond the clerical. The top level in this category, the class 2 certificate, makes specific provision (among others) for the graduate of "a library course of at least two years, that the Minister deems adequate." Certainly as graduates of the technician programs become available, this provision should help to create a category of employment for them, and should influence library boards and administrators in revising their position classifications and salary schedules to accomodate this new class of worker. (Don't forget, however, that this certification applies only to the public libraries of the province.)

CURRICULUM PLANNING AND CONTENT

Despite the differences from the U. S. pattern, it must be emphasized that with respect both to community college development and to technician training programs, we in Canada are far behind and have much to learn from the American experience. Already this experience is being applied and adapted in Canada, certainly in the planning of the technician programs. Much use has already been made of the

excellent Martinson Report.[1] If, for example, the actual curricula developed or outlined to date are examined, they will be seen to bear a striking resemblance to U. S. curricula: in balance between liberal arts and library courses, in provision for electives, in actual titles of courses both liberal arts and library. The Canadian courses are, so far, fairly cautious and middle-of-the-road. The program at Ryerson Polytechnical Institute (where there is access to the necessary equipment) includes a course in "electronic equipment and computers" - this is exceptional. The Community College programs, more conservative and more practical, include both "Machines in library work" and "Audio-visual services." Otherwise, the titles of courses, the hours allotted, the provision for field practice and observation - all these would sound very familiar to American ears, and hence need not be recited here.

A few specific comments on curricula: while recognizing (and indeed insisting on) the need for a strong liberal arts content in the curriculum, I must confess to a deep-rooted suspicion of certain types of "survey courses" which can (but need not) be so superficial as to be worse than useless. When I see a title such as "Man in Society," for example, I wonder how this course is going to be treated, and how much the student is going to get out of it; I suspect it may be pretty thin on both counts. Certainly such courses, which occur frequently, need in my opinion to be "beefed up" by the addition of more specific ones with practical as well as liberal implications; for example, "practical psychology" and "techniques of supervision" - to the extent that these can be taught. Obviously, if a library technician category is to have any meaning, the graduate must be expected to possess at least a rudimentary knowledge of human psychology, of how to work with groups and individuals, and how to supervise clerical workers and/or other technicians.

I also wonder how necessary it is to introduce an "English language" course at such an elementary level as is proposed in the Ontario Community College curriculum, described as follows: "A study of the English language based on historical principles and approached through reading to include a study of the word, sentence, paragraph and larger units of writing; English grammar . . . ." This after twelve years of basic education? ? ! !

[1] John L. Martinson, Vocational training for library technicians: a survey of experience to date. Washington, D. C., Communication Service Corporation, 1965.

T.L.C. FOR MACHINES

One recommendation I would make is for a strong emphasis on Audio-visual techniques in library technician training programs. Here I agree substantially with the comments made in the Martinson report, though I do not go all the way with Marshall McLuhan (to whom Martinson refers) in predicting the end of "typographic man," etc. Martinson's conclusion is intriguing: "It could be that the library technicians of today will become the information technicians of the future, not because of instruction in computers and electronic data processing which might be introduced into the curriculum, but because of the training they receive now in Audio-visual media. Likewise, the chief distinction between the library sub-professional and the professional may turn out to be the greater familiarity of the former with the use of radio, television, and film rather than the greater bibliographical sophistication of the latter" (p. 113). I think Martinson overstates his case: why not place computers and electronic data processing (i.e., all machine applications) alongside audio-visual techniques as falling within the competence of the library technician? I find it not inconceivable that a further distinction between sub-professional and professional may well lie in the "greater familiarity" of the former with machines, data processing, and computer applications. Surely at the technical level (excluding those rare creatures engaged at theoretical and research levels in mathematics, linguistics and systems planning) the library technician is the person (and the only person) who should be involved in the actual operation of the machines and in supplying them with all the T.L.C. they require.

As we learn to live with the machine, instead of being alternately either afraid of it or infatuated with it, we will be better able to let the machine assume its rightful place, as a means to an end: the end being, as Martinson states in his introduction, the managing of "collisions between people and ideas" - which is librarianship. We are now in my opinion going through a difficult transitional stage in which we have become confused as to means and ends. But I believe we are beginning to come out of this confusion, and the library technician development should contribute to greater clarity.

CHANGING ATTITUDES IN THE PROFESSION

Insofar as Canadian experience is concerned, it is too early to come to any conclusions about technician training programs or about curricula. We have no graduates of two-year programs whose performance we can observe. Out attitude must be a combination of critical concern and suspended judgment. In this developmental and experimental stage we require open-ended curriculum planning - and open-minded librarians. We must make sure that the program continues to allow room for local adaptations of the basic curriculum. It is essential that the library profession be, if not in charge of the whole development, at least thoroughly involved in it, and thereby exercise a vital influence in guiding its direction. But, having achieved this, we must let experience prove the worth (or otherwise) of specific programs, and be prepared to adapt and revise the programs when necessary. Above all, the profession must be both positive and flexible in its approach. It is encouraging in this respect to note that other library organizations, including the Canadian Library Association, and the Quebec Library Association, have set up committees which are working on basic standards, programs and curricula for library technician training.

Technician programs have had to meet many objections from the profession. These objections seem to fall into three main classes: a) it is argued that inservice training is preferable - but of course the multiple waste of professional time involved in such training, the lack of mobility for the trainees, and the lack of any tangible status (e.g. a diploma) constitute an effective answer; b) it is argued that technicians will in their jobs encroach on professional territory - but surely this can only happen if we let it, i.e., if we are unable to define job responsibilities clearly, and especially if we are confused as to what is "professional territory"; c) it is argued, in effect, that "a little knowledge is a dangerous thing" - but this can only happen if the knowledge is seen out of focus, or interpreted without perspective - and this again depends upon professional direction both in training and on the job. Such fears reflect personal or professional insecurity far more than objective factors, and we need to be reminded of the following, quoted from an article in Special Libraries, December 1962, p. 603: "To view a total operation in perspective shows the relationship of the various parts and assures each worker in a field of the importance of his contribution to the whole effort. This awareness has, as by-products, greater teamwork, better quality performance, and greater enthusiasm for more efficient accomplishment."

In the last two years, there has been among Ontario librarians a marked shift from resistance to qualified support for library technician programs. There are of course serious problems still to be met: libraries must make room for technicians, must up-grade their position classifications to allow for this new category, and must offer salaries, increments and promotion possibilities adequate to provide motivation for potential graduates. Here, a very great deal depends on the ability of the administrators to see what is involved, to take the long rather than the short view, in other words to welcome the trend and to co-operate with it. In his carefully reasoned article in the Library Journal, May 1, 1966 ("Manpower: a call for action," p. 1797), Lester Asheim emphasizes in conclusion that "the separation of training from education (i.e. as between technician and graduate programs) can result in improvements in the field only if library administrators will accept these distinctions in their hiring policies and in the utilization of their personnel. Can administrators be trusted to place the good of the profession above expediency? In other words, is librarianship really a profession?"

TOWARDS A RE-DEFINITION OF PROFESSIONAL TASKS

Finally, inherent in much of what I have said but here stated more explicitly is my conviction that development of library technician training programs will, above all, serve to clarify two things.

They will, first, serve to clarify what are professional and non-professional tasks in libraries. How much of what we cling to (still) is really technical or even mechanical in nature?

How much cataloguing?
How much reference work?
How much bibliography?
How much information retrieval?
How much literature searching?
How much reader-advisory work?
How much administration, in fact?

The real problem here is our own resistance to the elimination (from our own work) of certain traditionally "professional" tasks. The fight to achieve this will have to be waged harder - and first, within ourselves, where we meet our own encrusted habit, prejudice, laziness, fear. But it is often true that for objective reasons certain sectors of the profession seem at times to be more resistant. They appear to have "vested interests" (administrative or psychological) in the old wasteful ways of doing things. In my own observation, I must say quite candidly that cataloguers sometimes seem to assume this role; but I know that in other instances cataloguers have been in the van of far-reaching schemes for the rationalization and reorganization of library resources, policies and procedures. Surely it is a fact of considerable significance that the term "technical services division" has replaced "cataloguing department" in so many libraries - for so much of what is done is indeed technical in nature.

The development of successful technician programs will, in turn, help to force a genuine redefinition of what is a professional librarian. He will then emerge not only as a "manager of information", as a policy planner and decision maker, and as an administrator, but <u>also</u> as a scholar, a subject specialist, an interpreter of the <u>content</u> of books and materials; in other words, not merely an organizer of the surface characteristics thereof, which <u>is</u> technical.

Does this come dangerously close to a teaching role for the librarian? Yes! - as Melville Dewey long ago recognized, the librarian <u>is</u> a special sort of teacher. He needs to become <u>involved</u> with his materials, with the contents thereof, and with his clients, who are seeking information and assistance therefrom. He has tended to abandon this role as he sought to adjust to the demands of a technological society. Technician training, under professional direction, is part of this adjustment. Now, hopefully, he can begin to recover his original and basic role - but at a higher level of sophistication and in tune with present day demands.

TOWARDS CLARITY IN GRADUATE PROGRAMS

Technician training courses will also serve to clarify the tole and curricular offerings of the graduate library schools. Here, indeed, they are not a threat, but a blessing in disguise.

There will be, first, a <u>quantitative</u> effect. That is, in taking over the technical elements now taught perforce in library schools, there will be more room for some non-technical elements now taught but which require expansion within the curriculum, e.g., literature courses, book selection, subject specialties, type-of-library electives, specialized applications such as automation, administration, etc. There should, at the same time, be a general loosening up of the curriculum, allowing more room for electives and specializations.

As a minor example of the process of curriculum revision resulting partly from the (anticipated) impact of technician training programs, at the University of Toronto School of Library Science a unit on "order procedures" has been removed from the Library Collections Course; and a course on "Library Records" has been abolished.

More important, however, should be the <u>qualitative</u> effects, that is in helping to force an "agonizing reappraisal" of what professional education really requires in 1967 - or 1984. As Lester Asheim reminds us, the schools at the graduate level "should be concerned with principles, theory, research, and analysis" (<u>Library Journal</u>, May 1, 1967, p. 1797). A more specific and a helpfully provocative proposal was made by Ruth Warncke in her article, "The Fifth-Year Halo" in <u>Library Journal</u>, October 15, 1966, pp. 4883-4:

"That we upgrade the fifth-year program, accepting only students of high qualifications, providing a demanding (not just overloaded) and exciting curriculum, and turning out students who are ready to accept a great deal of responsibility immediately. The curriculum should produce administrators, subject specialists, advanced cataloguers, and information specialists. A school librarian with a fifth-year degree should be ready to take a position as the head of a library in a large school, or

as a supervisor in a medium-sized system; the science librarian should be able to develop a science collection from scratch, or to make and carry out plans for putting it to the most effective use; the catalogers should work only on original cataloging of materials presenting special problems; and the information specialists will be ready to work with research teams, or to design systems. These people will have to be paid well above the present salaries for fifth-year graduates."

To Miss Warncke's proposal, I should like to add my own strong conviction that in true graduate education there must be both an inner and an outer dimension. The inner dimension stresses whatever will help to develop librarians with book knowledge, literature familiarity, selection skills and "collection sense," as interpreters of content, able to become involved with materials and clients as suggested above. The outer dimension in graduate education must stress whatever will help to develop librarians with "social science savvy," that is, a sophisticated understanding of how our society works - institutions, government, politics, social groups, boards and committees. For lack of a better term "Sociology of librarianship" must be taught, to enable libraries and librarians to contribute to the solving of pressing problems in the larger context of their own operations - and to work with professionals, practitioners and volunteers in other fields in concerted and effective attack on relevant problems of the total society.

Who knows? Librarians, thanks partly to library technician training programs, may actually regain the role and status of bookman and scholar - and reinforce it with that of social pioneer and participant. This, I submit, is "a consummation devoutly to be wished."

NOTE: Copy was not supplied for the introductory presentations of the two panels, but their remarks have been summarized in the body of the preceding text. Material on the following pages of Appendix I consists of the presentation by the chief speakers and panelists.

APPENDIX II

ROSTER OF NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON LIBRARY TECHNOLOGY

Jeanne M. Aber
Illinois Teachers College
Chicago, Illinois

Loren H. Allen
Sauk Valley College
Dixon, Illinois

Patricia Amundsen
National Safety Council
Chicago, Illinois

Lester Asheim
American Library Association
Chicago, Illinois

Violetta Bernadas
National Safety Council
Chicago, Illinois

Elaine M. Bradpher
Urban Training Center for
Christian Mission
Chicago, Illinois

Theresa C. Dutch
Coppin State Teachers College
Baltimore, Maryland

Robert Fraser
State University of New York
Central Staff
Albany, New York

Eunice Gemmill
Illinois Bureau of Employ-
ment Security
Chicago, Illinois

Gertruda Granatelli
Velsico Chemical Corporation
Chicago, Illinois

Mildred Grant
National Safety Council
Chicago, Illinois

Noel R. Grego
Wilson Junior College
Chicago, Illinois

Mrs. Eleanor Haddow
St. Clair College
Windsor, Ontario

Bernice E. Headings
Ferris State College
Big Rapids, Michigan

Charles H. Held
Albion College
Albion, Michigan

Margarette Hills
MacCormac College
Chicago, Illinois

Minnie V. Hoch
Baltimore Junior College
Baltimore, Maryland

Diana Hovorka
State University of New York
Alfred, New York

Dean Paul Johnson
Catonsville Community College
Baltimore, Maryland

Araxie Kalvonjian
Kenosha Technical Institute
Kenosha, Wisconsin

Nancy Klaprat
Chicago, Illinois

Hattie M. Knight
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah

Ella Kwon
Lewis College
Lockport, Illinois

John Marshall
University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario

Sister Mary Chrysantha
Felician College
Chicago, Illinois

Andrew Melnyk
Wright Junior College
Chicago, Illinois

John B. Nicholson, Jr.
Catonsville Community College
Baltimore, Maryland

Catherine L. Nipe
Salen Technical Institute
Penns Grove, New Jersey

Ira J. Peskind
Loop College
Chicago, Illinois

William J. Powers
Chicago Bar Association
Chicago, Illinois

Nancy Pruter
National Safety Council
Chicago, Illinois

Mary L. Reading
Marie H. Katzenbach School
for the Deaf
West Trenton, New Jersey

Bernard E. Richardson
Associated Colleges of the
Midwest
Mount Vernon, Iowa

Mary Frances Root
Black Hawk College
Moline, Illinois

Albert Rybiansky
Lewis College
Lockport, Illinois

Seymour Schneider
Illinois Teachers College
Chicago, Illinois

John Sherrod
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission
Washington, D. C.

Marjorie B. Sing
Vancouver City College
Vancouver, British, Columbia

Lottie M. Skidmore
Joliet Junior College
Joliet, Illinois

Lorraine Snyder
State University of New York
Alfred, New York

Orlin C. Spicer
Morton Junior College
Cicero, Illinois

Rose L. Vormelker
Vice-president and President-elect
Library Education Division
American Library Association

Aline C. Wisdom
Citrus College
Azusa, California

William Woods
Cook County Law Library
Chicago, Illinois

Helen Yast
American Hospital Association
Chicago, Illinois

Sherman Zelinsky
Danville Junior College
Danville, Illinois

Marjorie Feldman
Central YMCA Community College
Chicago, Illinois

APPENDIX III

INSTITUTIONS OFFERING ONE AND TWO YEAR PROGRAMS IN LIBRARY TECHNOLOGY

The following listings of institutions offering courses in Library Technology has been supplied through the kindness of Charles H. Held, Librarian, Albion College, Albion, Michigan.

CALIFORNIA

Chabot Junior College	Hayward California
Citrus Junior College	Azusa, California
City College of San Francisco	San Francisco, California
College of the Siskiyous	Weed, California
Foothill College	Los Altos, California
Fullerton Junior College	Fullerton, California
Gavilan College	Hollister, California
Los Angeles Trade-Technical College	Los Angeles, California
Mount San Antonio College	Walnut, California
Pasadena City College	Pasadena, California
Porterville College	Porterville, California
Palomar College	San Marcos, California
Rio Hondo Junior College	Santa Fe Springs, Calif.

COLORADO

Lamar Junior College	Lamar, Colorado
Mesa College	Grand Junction, Colorado

FLORIDA

Miami-Dade Junior College	Miami, Florida
Polk Junior College	Winter Haven, Florida

ILLINOIS

Central YMCA Community College	Chicago, Illinois
MacCormac Junior College	Chicago, Illinois
Sauk Valley College	Dixon, Illinois

MARYLAND

Catonsville Community College	Baltimore, Maryland

MICHIGAN

Ferris State College	Big Rapids, Michigan
Highland Park Junior College	Highland Park, Michigan
Lansing Community College	Lansing, Michigan
Muskegon Community College	Muskegon, Michigan
Oakland Community College	Union Lake, Michigan

NEW JERSEY

Salem County Technical Institute	Penns Grove, New Jersey

NEW YORK

Borough of Manhattan Community College	New York, New York
Ballard School of the YMCA	New York, New York

OHIO

University of Toledo	Toledo, Ohio

OREGON	
Treasure Valley Community College	Ontario, Oregon
PENNSYLVANIA	
Allegheny College	Meadville, Pennsylvania
UTAH	
Brigham Young University	Provo, Utah
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	
Temple Business School	Washington, D. C.
U. S. Department of Agriculture Graduate School	Washington, D. C.
PUERTO RICO	
Puerto Rico Junior College	Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico

CANADA

University of Calgary	Calgary, Alberta
Alberta Technical Institute	Calgary, Alberta
Manitoba Institute of Technology Library	Winnipeg, Manitoba
Lakehead University Library	Port Arthur, Ontario
Ryerson Polytechnical Institute	Toronto, Ontario
St. Clair College	Windsor, Ontario
College de Jonquière	Jonquière, Quebec
Mount Royal Junior College	Calgary, Alberta
Vancouver City College	Vancouver, British Columbia

PROGRAMS FORMERLY OFFERED, NOW DISCONTINUED

Diablo Valley College	Concord California
Erie County Technical Institute	Buffalo, New York
Orange County Community College	Middletown, New York